

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9 and 10 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,117) in view of Jacobs (U.S. Patent No. 6,225,995); and claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs and further in view of Fujita. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 are not taught or suggested by Fujita or Jacobs whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Various amendments were made throughout the claims to more clearly recite that the relational information manages the condition of the resources

used in execution of a SQL program and a JAVA program invoked by the SQL program, the resource table, the release resource table, dynamic resource management for securing resources in execution of the program and the dynamic information features of the present invention alleged by the Examiner to not have been clearly recited in the claims as they existed prior to the Office Action.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Fujita or Jacobs whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

Jacobs, in col. 8, line 15-33 refers to PL/SQL runtime and a Java runtime interpreter as an example of a cartridge. In col. 8, lines 28-30, there is described "The Java runtime interpreter cartridge enables web application developers to write server-side JAVA applications to process browser requests." This means that the web application developers can write the server-side JAVA applications. However, Jacob's server-side is not a server in a DBMS (database Management System), but a web application server (Fig.2, 280). Thus, the server-side JAVA applications are not JAVA stored programs.

Moreover, Jacobs and Fujita do not make reference to anything about the solution or measures for implementing a commit/rollback request as in the present invention. The Examiner points out that Applicants' resource managing table and release resource managing table are known as they correspond to Fujita's resource managing table T1 and lock managing table T2, respectively.

However, although Applicants' resource managing table is functionally similar to Fujita's resource managing table T1 Applicants' release resource managing table does entirely differ from Fujita's lock managing table T2 in structure and function. The cited lock managing table T2 is used to manage a transaction and resources occupied by the transaction (refer to co1.9, lines 26-40).

Applicants' release resource managing table is to manage resources to leave them reserved at a commit/rollback request from the stored program constituting a transaction, together with the corresponding data of the resource managing table. In more detail, Fujita's table T2 stores information which a lock manager manages internally upon a request of resource exclusive acquisition and release operation when resources managed in a resource managing table T1 are exclusive ones (refer to co1.9, lines 6-19).

In contrast, Applicants' release resource managing table is used to select resources to be held without releasing at a COMMIT request from a stored program. Fujita does not teach or suggest not only a stored program, but also measures for maintaining resources at a COMMIT/ROLLBACK request of the transaction.

Claim 1 of the present application recites "referring, at release of a transaction from the stored program, to a release resource managing table and the resource managing table to determine a reserved resource which is registered in the resource managing table and which is not registered in the release resource managing table". The essence of this feature of the present invention is to identify resources which a source application calling a Java stored program has already reserved into a DBMS and resources reserved into the DBMS by execution of the Java stored program, using a resource

managing table and a release resource managing table. This essential feature of the present invention as recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by the combination of Jacobs and Fujita.

Thus, both Jacobs and Fujita fail to teach or suggest reserving a resource, an execution of a query from the stored program and registering information about the reserved resource in a resource managing table which corresponds to resources already reserved in execution of the query having invoked the stored program as recited in the claims.

Further, both Jacobs and Fujita fail to teach or suggest referring, at a release of a transaction from the stored program, to a release resource managing table and the resource managing table to determine a reserved resource which is registered in the resource and which is not registered in the resource managing table and releasing the reserved resource having been determined by the referring step as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since both Fujita and Jacobs fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims, the combination of Fujita and Jacobs does not render obvious the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 as being unpatentable over Fujita in view of Jacobs is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.41052X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120